

REMARKS

In reply to the above Office Action, claims 1-6 have been cancelled and replaced by new claims 19-21 to avoid the rejection of the claims under §112, second paragraph, and to patentably distinguish the claims over the cited prior art. Support for the claims can be found in claims 1-6 as well as, for example, page 16 beginning at line 6.

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being obvious over either Oda or Ferdinandsen in view of Takayama and claims 2-4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for being obvious over either Oda or Ferdinandsen in view of Takayama and further in view of Choi or Hillman. While the Examiner did not mention claim 6, it is believed the Examiner intended to include it in the second rejection since it is dependent from claim 3.

Oda discloses an apparatus and method for molding using a means for preliminary compaction, but does not teach monitoring the molding. Ferdinandsen is directed to a method and an apparatus for operating a molding plant and teaches comparing actual image data with previously stored, ideal image data and then controlling the operation of the plant based on the comparison, to avoid defective molding.

Takayama is directed to a method and an apparatus for monitoring a large sized industrial machine including press-molding workpieces. Choi is directed to a method and an apparatus for controlling a machine for injection molding as is Hillman.

However, none of the references teaches nor suggests in a monitoring system for a molding apparatus a local unit that has means for determining whether signals from sensors are within a predetermined range of a squeezing pressure and a predetermined range of a mold height and then sending a warning signal to a

communication network if the signals are outside the predetermined ranges as set forth in new claim 19.

Further, none of the references teaches or suggests detecting by sensors attributes associated with a molding apparatus, including squeezing, air pressure, and properties of the molding sand that are used in the molding apparatus, and sending signals that correspond to the attributes by a local unit over a communication network to a remote unit as set forth in new claim 21.

Accordingly, it is not believed that claims 19 and 21 or claims 20 and 22 dependent therefrom are obvious in view of the cited combinations of references and their withdrawal as a ground of rejection of the claims is therefore requested.

It is believed claims 19-22 are in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: December 1, 2004

By: 
Arthur S. Garrett
Reg. No. 20,338

816404_1